

REMARKS

The above-identified Office Action was a final rejection of Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 10, 15, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 29 and 31 of the referenced application. In addition, Claims 7, 8, 17, 18, 27, 28 and 32-34 were objected to as depending from rejected claims. The foregoing amendment to the claims is intended to place the application in condition for allowance. Specifically, the rejected claims have been cancelled, and objected to claims have been amended to place them in condition for allowance. In addition, withdrawn Claims 35-42 were cancelled. In view of these amendments and the following reasoning for allowance, the applicants hereby respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the subject application.

Claims 1, 5, 10, 15, 20 and 25 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowley et al. (Rotation Invariant Neural Network-Based Face Detection) in view of Baluja et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,128, 397. It is contended in the Office Action that Rowley teaches all the elements of the rejected claims with the exception of identifying a person from an image of their face. However, it is further contended that the Baluja reference does teach this feature. Thus, it was concluded that it would have been obvious to incorporate the Baluja teachings into Rowley to produce the applicants' claimed invention. In addition, Claims 6, 9, 16, 19, 26, 29 and 31 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowley in view of Baluja, and in further view of Turk et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,164,992. It is contended in the Office Action that the Rowley-Baluja combination teaches all the elements of the rejected claims with the exception of the details of using PCA. However, it is further contended that the Turk reference teaches this feature. Thus, it was concluded that it would have been obvious to incorporate the Turk teachings into the Rowley-Baluja combination to produce the applicants' claimed invention. In addition, as indicated above, Claims 7, 8, 17, 18, 27, 28 and 32-34 were objected to as being dependent upon the rejected claims. The Examiner stated that these claims

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

While no admission is made that the rejected claims are actually made obvious by the cited references, the applicants have chosen to amend the claims as suggested in the final Office Action to further the prosecution of the application and expedite its allowance. More particularly, the rejected claims have been cancelled, and the objected to claims were rewritten as suggested by the Examiner.

In summary, it is respectfully requested that the objection to remaining Claims 7, 8, 17, 18, 27, 28 and 32-34 be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard T. Lyon
Registration No. 37,385
Attorney for Applicant

LYON & HARR, LLP
300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 800
Oxnard, CA 93036
(805) 278-8855